## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

STEVE KENYATTA WILSON BRIGGS,

Case No. 17-cv-06552-VC

Plaintiff,

ORDER DISMISSING CASE

v.

Re: Dkt. No. 69

UNIVERSAL PICTURES, et al.,

Defendants.

Steve Wilson Briggs has not met his burden of establishing that he properly served either Dana Brunetti or Kevin Spacey. He has provided no information to suggest that the purported agents he served – or at least attempted to serve – were in fact authorized either "by appointment or by law to receive service of process" for Spacey and Brunetti. Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(e)(2)(C). The fact that Todd Rubenstein of Morris Yorn Barnes Levine Krintzman Rubenstein Kohner & Gellman has represented Spacey in other actions is not evidence Rubenstein or Morris Yorn is authorized to accept service for Spacey. Likewise, the fact that Matt DelPiano of Creative Artists Agency is Dana Brunetti's talent agent does not suggest that DelPiano or Creative Artists Agency is authorized to accept service for Brunetti.

Moreover, even if Todd Rubenstein or Matt DelPiano were agents to Spacey or Brunetti, Briggs has not provided evidence to suggest that process was personally delivered to either DelPiano or Rubenstein, as would be required under either Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(e)(2)(C) or California law. *See* Dkt. Nos. 46-47. Nor has he provided evidence that Morris Yorn or Creative Artists Agency were properly served under either Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(h)(1)(B) or California law. *Id*.

Briggs has not shown good cause for his failure to properly serve Spacey and Brunetti. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). Inadvertent failure to comply with Rule 4 does not constitute good cause. *See Townsel v. Contra Costa County*, 820 F.2d 319, 320 (9th Cir. 1987). Moreover, there is no indication that Spacey or Brunetti have actually learned of this suit. *See Boudette v. Barnette*, 923 F.2d 754, 756 (9th Cir. 1991). The Court declines to otherwise extend the time for service of process. Thus, all counts against Brunetti and Spacey are dismissed without prejudice.

There are no federal claims asserted against any of the remaining defendants, and the Court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction on the state-law claims. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(3). Thus, these remaining claims are also dismissed without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 25, 2018

VINCE CHHABRIA United States District Judge